



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

shows how infinitely difficult, or rather how absolutely impossible, it is to establish a critically correct text of the Talmud, and to gain even a partially correct reading from the many various readings. The gentlemen who are preparing the new critical edition of the Talmud that has been recently announced are, therefore, right when they confine themselves to procuring a comparatively correct text such as is offered by the Munich MS. and the *Editio princeps*. Of course, such *variae lectiones* would, above all, have to be given as are found in the more ancient Talmudical documents. Of these latter, the MS., edited in such beautiful form by Mr. Schechter and Mr. Singer, deserves particular notice. Their festive gift came *post festem*, but it is none the less welcome, not only to the scholar to whom it was offered, but to all who have the study of Talmudics at heart.

W. BACHER.

### PHILONEAN LITERATURE.

*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Philosophie und Religion*, von PAUL WENDLAND u. OTTO KERN, Berlin, 1895.

*Die Therapeuten*, von PAUL WENDLAND, Leipzig, 1896 (besonderer Abdruck aus dem 22<sup>n</sup>. Supplementband der Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie).

*Die Philonischen Citaten im Clemens v. Alexandria* (besonderer Abdruck u. s. w.), von PAUL WENDLAND, 1896.

I HAVE joined these three works because they all three deal with the same range of subjects. In the first Dr. Wendland deals with the form of moral discourse known as the Diatribé, with special reference to the *Vita Contemplativa* and the essay *Quod omnis probus liber* of Philo. He shows how this form of literature culminated in the first century A.D., and how these two essays of Philo exemplify it. The aim of such essays was to sketch out a life according to nature after the Stoic-Cynical conception of it, and to contrast its simple nobility with the life of luxury and indolence.

Incidentally Dr. Wendland shows that these two works could only have been produced in the first decades of the first century and at no later epoch.

The second of the three works is a substantive and important contribution to the controversy respecting the authorship and date of the description of the Therapeutae. In seven chapters overflowing

with learning and full of acumen, Dr. Wendland deals with the direct and indirect transmission of the book, with its place among Philo's works and in Jewish literature, with its language and style, with the Philonean elements in the picture of the Therapeutae, with the origin of the sect; and lastly, he refutes the view that they were Christians. The bulk of these chapters, seventy-five pages of close print, was written before my own edition of Philo's work appeared, and is therefore independent. It is all the more satisfactory to me that Dr. Wendland arrives at substantially the same conclusions respecting its authenticity as myself.

As to the tradition of the text, Dr. Wendland only differs from me in that he assigns to the Old Latin version an independence of the Greek MSS. and of the Armenian version, whereas I had regarded it as flowing from the common archetype of the Greek MSS. I am not sure he is not right. Such independence would consort with the great antiquity of the Latinity which seems to belong to the second century. It would also help to set back the focus of tradition at which the different texts converge. Dr. Wendland agrees with me that this meeting-point must have been long anterior to Eusebius, and his account of the Philonean tradition in Clement clinches this point. For he shows that Clement had a text of Philo (including the *Vita Contemplativa*) independent of all other known texts. The meeting-point of these early divergencies must lie far back in the second century.

Dr. Wendland finally dissipates Lucius' theory that the book was written as late as 300 A.D. in defence of Christian Monachism, by producing from Clement two distinct citations of it, and from Origen and Lactantius two more.

In his second chapter Dr. Wendland gives a most valuable account of the matter of the Jewish apologies for monotheism, which afterwards became the basis of Christian Apologies; and he shows that, instead of the *Vita Contemplativa* being imitated from Christian Apologies, the debt lies the other way. He agrees with me that the book formed part of a defence of the Jews, to which Philo's second account of the Essenes, preserved only by Eusebius, also belonged. The entire work may well have formed the lost *ὑποθετικά*. But I cannot agree with him and with Schürer in supposing that the title *Περὶ ἀρετῶν τὸ δ'* which heads the *Vita Contemplativa* in the best codices is the error of a scribe familiar with the title *Περὶ γ' ἀρετῶν*, which in the Codex Seldenianus and some others heads the three allied treatises *Περὶ ἀνδρείας*, *φιλανθρωπίας*, and *μετανοίας*. What has a fourth book about virtues to do with a book about three virtues? Moreover, how are we to explain the circumstance that in the best codex the *Legatio ad Gaium* bears the title *Περὶ ἀρετῶν τὸ α'* and

immediately precedes the *Vita Contemplativa*. I would not claim that my explanation of these supplementary titles is the true one, but it seems to agree better than Schürer's with probability, with the confessedly fragmentary state of the Legatio, and with Josephus' statement that Philo appeared before Gaius with a written defence of the Jews in his pocket, which he began to read out, only the emperor silenced him.

In his third chapter Dr. Wendland enters on a still more minute examination of the language and idiom of the *Vita Contemplativa* than I attempted. Several usages which I regarded as ἀπαξ λεγόμενα peculiar to the book, he parallels from Philo. He shows that in its use of ἀτίθασος, θεμέλιος for θεμέλιον, ἀνάπλεων before vowels, σκότους as genitive, and σκότῳ as dative, δυοῖν, ἀλλ' ἅττα, ἕτερα ἅττα, &c., the *Vita Contemplativa* is true to Philo's general usage. In such minute points as the use of prepositions it is also characteristically Philonean. It uses ἀνὰ κράτος, not κατὰ κράτος, ἄχρι and ἄνευ after consonants, and μέχρι and δίχα after vowels; ἐπί, μετά, σύν, ἄμα, παρά, ἐν, περὶ, ἐξ, ἕξω, are all used as Philo alone used them. In these and many similar points the *Vita Contemplativa* proclaims its Philonean authorship, and they are just those minute indicia of style and Grecity which in the ancient world, when the language was still living, would have escaped the notice of any imitator. "Ich habe nachgewiesen," says Dr. Wendland, "dass der Verfasser der *V. C.* in der Formbildung sowohl die feinen Atticismen als auch die späteren aus der lebenden Sprache geschöpften Formen mit Philo gemeinsam hat; dass er in der Auswahl alltäglicher Worte und Wendungen, wo der einzige Reichtum der griechischen Sprache der subjectiven Willkür und dem Geschmacke den weitesten Spielraum gewährt, sowohl in dem, was er meidet, als auch in dem, was er bevorzugt, mit Philo übereinstimmt; dass er in der verschiedenen Anwendung synonyme Präpositionen, in der hier waltenden Rücksicht auf Wohlklang und Meidung des Hiates, den philonischen Gesetzen sich unterwirft oder, besser gesagt, sie unwillkürlich und unbewusst anwendet; dass er selbst ein sprachliches Missverständniss Philo's teilt." The last words refer to Philo's use of ἀνορθιάζειν τὰ ὦτα, "to prick up the ears." ὀρθιάζειν means properly to "sing out" or "raise a boating song or shout." Philo confounds it, however, with ὀρθόω, and so couples ὦτα with it. Now this erroneous usage often occurs in Philo, but in no other Greek writer. Yet the writer of the *Vita Contemplativa* employs it. Would a forger have copied even a mistake of the writer he mimicked?

In his fourth chapter Dr. Wendland summarises Philo's picture of the Therapeutae, and tries to distinguish between what of it is objective and what is Philonean colouring. Here he is, I believe,

too much dominated by the belief that Philo's ways of envisaging the Mosaic law and life in general, were almost entirely confined to himself, and not shared by him with any considerable number of his countrymen. Without affirming the genuineness of the fragments of Aristobulus, I yet think that in this matter Dr. Wendland is in error; Philo so frequently refers to schools of interpreters adverse or favourable to his own ways of thinking that I cannot believe him to have been an isolated writer or thinker. His very predominance, not only in his own community, but among Palestinian Jews, negatives such a view; and so do his allusions to the *θεσπέσιοι ἄνδρες* from whom he had learned how to allegorize the law.

The wide diffusion within a few decades among the Christians of Logos-beliefs closely akin to Philo's, yet not to be directly derived from him, is another proof that his was no isolated position, but that he was one of a large school, which may have had pupils in every one of the large Jewish communities all round the Mediterranean. I do not therefore agree with Dr. Wendland's attempts to explain away the statement of the *Vita Contemplativa* that these Therapeutae were to be found all over the world, but had their headquarters at Alexandria.

Dr. Wendland (chap. v) propounds the view that the Therapeutae were scribes and students of Jewish law, of the Torah, who left their homes and families in order to consecrate themselves to their work. Is it not possible that they occupied themselves rather with the work of copying and interpreting the LXX than with the study of the Hebrew original? That they were mainly a Greek sect their use of words like *μοναστήριον* and *σεμνείον* proves. Clement of Alexandria styles Philo "the Pythagorean." May not the Therapeutae have been Pythagoreans to an equal extent, and have shared with Philo his cult of numbers and of their mysterious properties?

Dr. Wendland believes that they really held a high-feast every forty-ninth day, and that the banquet described is not merely the Pentecostal meal. But if they departed from Jewish practice so widely as to introduce a wholly new feast recurring every seven weeks, may they not have been fired, like Philo himself, with the ideals of the Greek Stoico-Cynical philosophy?

At the end of this chapter Dr. Wendland suggests that the *Vita Contemplativa* was written by Philo as a counterblast to Chairemon's account of the Egyptian priests preserved by Porphyry. This is rather fanciful, in my opinion, nor do I think that the treatise was written so late as after 40 A.D., as this view would require it to be. If there be any real connexion beyond community of atmosphere, then I think Chairemon was influenced by Philo's treatise, and not *vice versa*.

In his sixth chapter Dr. Wendland tears Lucius to shreds, and in his seventh enters a *caveat* against the assumption that we have so complete a knowledge of Jewish communities of the first century and of all the varieties of their religious life and developments as to say that this or that was impossible.

Prof. Schürer has already criticized this penetrating work of Dr. Wendland in the *Theol. Litt. Ztg.* He is still not convinced that the *Vita Contemplativa* is a work of Philo's; but he admits that Clement and Origen had it in their hands. He began by disbelieving its authenticity on the somewhat shallow grounds advanced by Lucius. My own work, and still more this of Dr. Wendland's, have dissipated these grounds *tenués in auras*, and the premises on which Schürer based his conclusion are gone all but a very meagre remnant. I sincerely hope that before long he will see good reason for sending his conclusion after the premises upon which it rested.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

#### "THE MESSIAH-IDEAL."

*The Messiah-Ideal. Comparative Religions, Legislation, Doctrines, and Forms unfolding Ideal.* 2 vols. By MAURICE FLUEGEL. (Baltimore, 1896.)

THE author of this study of comparative religion is known to the readers of our QUARTERLY by the review which we devoted to the *Spirit of the Biblical Legislation* (*J. Q. R.* VI, 580). The present work (in two volumes) was long planned by the author. He says, at the beginning of his introduction: "It was about ten years ago, at the University Library of Leipzig, Germany, that I conceived the idea of writing a series of treatises on the several religions and legislations of the foremost nations of history. I was then, for the first time, deeply engrossed by the study of the hoary Persian religion, with its sacred books and their leading idea, doctrines, and rites. I felt struck with the revelation of the great parallel lines and the affinity of the Zend-Avesta with the Bible, the Gospel, and the Koran. Gradually the far-reaching and cheering idea of the unity of religions dawned upon my horizon, like an illuminating flash of lightning in midnight darkness." The result was as the author felt "akin almost to Plato's doctrine that our ideas are primordial and not acquired. Long ago that idea has been foreshadowed in my early biblical reading. It was that sacred legend then, from hoary times, that man had worshipped but *Yahweh*, that the *Yahweh-cult* had been firmly established during the Adamic era of civilization, and